

Remarks

In an Office Action dated April 6, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, stating that the limitation "said availability bits" has insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant is amending these claims to recite "said busy bit map and said idle bit map" instead of "said availability bits". Clearly, there is an antecedent basis for the busy bit map and the idle bit map.

Applicant is amending claims 21 and 22 to substitute the word "contiguous" for "continuous"; this makes these claims consistent with similar phraseology of claims 8 and 18.

The Examiner rejected claims 18 and 22 stating that Applicant's specification fails to disclose the corresponding means for storing a separate busy bit map and a separate idle bit map. Applicant respectfully submits that FIG. 7 clearly shows a separate busy bit map 710 and idle bit map 720. The use of these maps for establishing the size of each control block group is described on page 10, lines 7-20. All of the apparatus diagrams in Applicant's disclosure are memory blocks such as the busy bit map and idle bit map.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the grounds for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, have been overcome by the above argument and the cited subject matter in Applicant's disclosure.

The Examiner rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,950,907 (Garnett). The character and functions of the dirty bit indicators in Garnett is completely different from the functions of the busy bit map and idle bit map. Specifically, Garnett does not show busy bit maps and idle bit maps which indicate the location and size of individual user memory blocks. Applicant's busy bit map and idle bit map are not used to identify portions of the main user memory which have been "dirtied" in Garnett's terminology. Applicant's busy bit maps and idle bit maps can be used to reconstruct the layout of user memory. If an error has been detected indicating that the control blocks no longer fully indicate the layout of memory then, according to the teachings of Applicant's invention, the bit maps can be used to reinitialize the memory layout since these bit maps contain enough information to indicate the size of busy (active) memory blocks and the size and location of idle memory

blocks. From these locations and sizes, the linked list of active (busy) and available (idle) memory blocks can be reinitialized. Separate means, not discussed in Applicant's Disclosure, are required to detect which memory blocks have had their internal contents "dirtied".

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of Garnett does not teach Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claims 21 and 22.

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teachings of U.S. Patent 5,742,797 (Celi) in view of Garnett.

The Examiner states that Celi does not disclose the functions cited from Garnett above with respect to claims 21 and 22. Applicant respectfully submits that the above arguments with respect to Garnett show that Garnett does not disclose the subject matter of claims 21 and 22 hence the subject matter of the portions of claims 8 and 18 not apparently disclosed by Celi.

Alternatively, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of Celi and Garnett is not from "the same field of endeavor of memory control using status bits". While both prior art documents use status bits, the bits in Celi and Garnett are used for totally different purposes. In Celi the bits are used to help maintain a memory layout function which can dynamically allocate and de-allocate different size blocks of user memory. The bits in Garnett are used to keep track of which blocks of user memory have been "dirtied". Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Celi and Garnett can only be combined using the knowledge gained from Applicant's disclosure.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claims 8 and 18 should be held allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the grounds for the rejection of claims 8, 18, 21 and 22, allow these claims as amended, and pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner feels that a voice or fax contact would help to advance the

prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at telephone number 630 469-3575.

Respectfully submitted

A. A. Charles



by Werner Ulrich  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 30810

Date: June 30, 2007